BACONIANA.

VOL. XI. *Third Series.* JANUARY, 1913. No. 41.

FRANCIS BACON AS TREASURER OF GRAY'S INN.

(Continued).

THE Prince of Purpoole, so named after the manor in which Gray's Inn is situate, was Henry Helme, a young student of the Inn and a graceful dancer; and certain chambers were placed at his disposal and called the Presence and Council Chamber. Another set of chambers was assigned to the Inner Temple, which was invited to send an ambassador to the Court. Privy Councillors, Officers of State, of Law, and of the Household, were duly appointed, as well as gentlemen pensioners, to attend the person of the Prince, with Bacon's cousin, William Cooke, who afterwards married the daughter and heiress of Sir Thomas Lucy, of Charlecote, as Captain of the Guard.

A generous selection of officers was made, for the names include a number of members who had been suspended by the Benchers a few years before in consequence of their unruly behaviour on Candlemas night. Robert Faldo was appointed Master of Requests; Richard Darley, Master of the Jewels; William Holt, Attorney-General; Francis Markham, Lord Chamberlain of the Household; and Edward Jones, Clerk of the

Council. All of these members had been suspended in 1590 for their riotous celebration of the Lord of Misrule (see BACONIANA, Vol. IX., p. 251).

The Prince's treasury was supplied by contributions demanded by way of a benevolence under the authority of Privy Seals. Lord Burleigh sent a donation of £10 and a purse of fine needlework, while Edward Jones, "the great translator of books," was deputed to collect contributions from foreigners.

A week was spent in preparation, and on the 20th December, 1594, the gorgeous pageant began with a State procession of the Prince from his lodging to the hall, attended by marshals and trumpeters and all the officers of his Court. A flourish of trumpets, and the Prince took his seat upon the throne, the councillors ranged round the table, while the King-at-Arms delivered the royal proclamation. Again the trumpets sounded and the Prince's champion, in full armour, mounted on horseback, entered the hall and, throwing down his gage, he challenged anyone who dared to dispute the Prince's title. Then the King-at-Arms described in heraldic terms the arms of the Prince; the Attorney-General delivered a speech of welcome and congratulation, to which the Prince responded; the Solicitor-General produced the records, and as their names were called the nobles advanced towards the throne and on their knees did homage to their Prince. Then the Prince summoned the Master of the Revels, and the evening was spent in lively dances, old measures and galliards.

Another week passed, and the Prince again proceeded from his lodging to the hall in royal state, and the ambassador from the Inner Temple was presented to his Highness with great ceremony and graceful speeches. This was the first "grand night" at Gray's Inn, and an elaborate programme had been prepared for the entertainment of the visitors. A stage had been erected in

the hall with scaffolds reaching to the roof, and a company of professional actors had been engaged for the dramatic performances. Unfortunately the hall was packed and the audience pushed their way to the front, so that the Prince and his officers were helpless; the actors were embarrassed, as they had no room for acting; and the ambassador from the Temple, regarding the crowding and disorder as an insult, retired from the hall with the other Templarians. A scene of tumult followed, until at last it was decided to abandon the programme and resort to dancing and revelry with the ladies. Later in the evening, however, it was found possible to perform one at least of those "witty inventions" which had been originally intended for the entertainment of the guests. A *Comedy of Errors*, based upon the "Menechmus" of Plautus, was performed by the actors, and the so-called "night of errors" at Gray's Inn has thus become associated with a first night of one of the Shakespeare plays.

It is easy to imagine that the disorderly scenes in the hall, which must have offended the ladies no less than the visitors from the Temple, caused considerable uneasiness among the Benchers of Gray's Inn. The Court of the Prince of Purpoole, to which they had given their sanction and approval, had been the occasion of bringing discredit upon the Society. The privileges granted by them had been abused, and the proceedings gave offence to the guests whom they had invited to honour. If any ordinary person had been responsible for the extravagant humour of such proceedings, it is certain the Benchers would have put an end to their fantastic innovations and have ordered the abolition of the sham Prince and his Court and all the ridiculous burlesque which had been the occasion for so much disorder. But the wit that was capable of devising these inventions was also sufficient to find a way out of the trouble they

had caused; and so the serious grievance which resulted from the "night of errors" was cleverly removed by a device ingeniously prepared by the invisible author.

The plan was that of a mock trial, in which the accused was described as a sorcerer and charged with responsibility for the unfortunate disturbance. The Prince of Purpoole held his Court in the hall on the following evening and an individual, personating the prisoner, was brought in by the Lieutenant of the Tower, while the Sheriff impanelled a jury before whom the prisoner was arraigned. The Clerk of the Crown—a student named Roger Downes—read the indictment, which contained the following allegations :—

(1) That the prisoner had caused a stage to be built and scaffolds raised to the roof of the hall.

(2) That he had caused ladies and gentlemen of good condition to be invited, also the ambassador from the State of Templaria.

(3) That he had foisted a company of base and common fellows to make up disorders with a play of errors and confusions.

The prisoner appealed to the Prince that the Master of Requests might be allowed to read his petition.

It was a curious document, alleging that the law officers had exercised knavery and jugglery to throw dust in the eyes of the Prince, that things seen and done should appear but vain illusions, fancies, dreams, and enchantments wrought by a poor, harmless wretch who had never heard of such great matters in all his life.

At the conclusion of the petition the Prince pardoned the accused, but as the petition contained allegations against his officers and government he ordered the Master of Requests, with the Attorney and Solicitor-General, to be confined in the Tower.

And so the trouble passed off in jest and good humour,

without any damage to the state of the Prince of Purpoole.

The next proceeding was to remove the ambassador's resentment and to effect a reconciliation between Gray's Inn and the Templarians. Accordingly, another night of entertainment was arranged for the new year, and on this occasion an armed watch was ordered to be kept at the four gates of the Inn, so that ill-conditioned persons should not enter. The Lord Warden, personated by Humfrey Davenport, who afterwards became Chief Baron of the Exchequer, was deputed to supervise the guard.

The Ambassador and Templarians were invited to attend on the 3rd January, and a graceful masque was provided in their honour. It was the second "grand night" at Gray's Inn, and at the invitation of the Prince of Purpoole a distinguished audience attended, which included the Lord Treasurer and the Lord Keeper, the Earls of Shrewsbury, Cumberland, Northumberland, Southampton and Essex; Lords Buckhurst, Windsor, Mountjoy, Sheffield, Compton, Rich, and Monteagle, with a great number of knights, and ladies and other eminent persons.

The invisible author had again prepared an ingenious device for pouring oil on the troubled waters. A curtain was drawn aside and the archflamen of the goddess of Friendship was discovered standing at an altar, while around her were groups of nymphs and fairies who sang hymns in her praise. Then entered couples representing famous examples of friendship in history, and the last pair were Graius and Templarius lovingly linked arm in arm. They offered their incense on the altar, but the flame was choked with black vapour, until the archflamen, having performed some sorceries which caused the flame to burn bright and clear, declared them to be true and perfect friends and prophesied that their love would be eternal.

The masque being ended, the Prince invested the ambassador and twenty-four members of his retinue with the collar of Knighthood of the Order of the Helmet; and the King-at-Arms, having recited the history of its foundation, proceeded to read the articles of the Order, while each knight advanced in turn and kissed the helmet as a pledge of his fidelity.

The ceremony of investiture was followed with music; and a banquet was served by those knights of the Helmet who were members of the Inn. After the feast, a table was set in front of the throne, and round the table sat six Lords of the Council, who delivered "Baconian" speeches on the affairs of the kingdom. The speech on "Sports and Pastimes" by the sixth counsellor was more frivolous than the rest, and after the manner of Berowne in *Love's Labour Lost*, the courtier complained of the serious nature of the "strict observances." "What! nothing but tasks?" he protested; "nothing but working days? No feasting, no music, no dancing, no triumphs, no comedies, no love, no ladies?"

The Prince, having responded in a graceful speech, descended from his throne and led a lady by the hand to dance. The ambassador and courtiers followed his example, and the rest of the evening was given up to music, dancing and revelry. And thus ended, we are told, one of the most graceful Christmas entertainments that was ever presented to an audience of statesmen and courtiers.

Now let us pass to the second period, when Bacon was treasurer of Gray's Inn for nine consecutive years, from 1608 to 1617. During this time he was actively engaged in civil business, holding successively the offices of Solicitor and Attorney-General, and yet his enthusiasm for dramatic entertainments seems to have continued as fresh and keen as in his early years of

briefless irresponsibility. For example, among the festivities in celebration of the marriage of the Count Palatine and the Princess Elizabeth, at the beginning of 1613, there was a representation of a naval engagement on the Thames, followed by a masque, of which Bacon was "the chief contriver." The company of players assembled at Bankside, and it was arranged by Bacon that they should be conveyed by galleys from Southwark to Whitehall.

The following account is given by Chamberlain in a letter to Carleton, dated the 18th February, 1613 :—

"On Tuesday it came to Gray's Inn and the Inner Temple's turn to come with their masque, *whereof Sir Francis Bacon was the chief contriver;* and because the former came on horseback and in open chariots, they made choice to come by water from Winchester Place, in Southwark, which suited well with their device, which was the marriage of the river Thames to the Rhine; and their show by water was very gallant, by reason of infinite store of lights, very curiously set and placed, and many boats and barges with devices of light and lamps, with three peals of ordnance, one at their taking water, another in the Temple garden, and the last at their landing; which passage by water cost them better than three hundred pounds. They were received at the Privy stairs, and great expectation there was that they should every way excel their competitors that went before them, both in device, daintiness of apparel, and above all in dancing, wherein they are held excellent and esteemed for the properer men."

Owing to the contrariness of the tide, and the company attending the masquers being very disorderly, there appears to have been some delay, which had almost exhausted the patience of the Court. When the performers arrived at Westminster the hall was so

crowded that there was no room for them, and, worst of all, the King was so tired and sleepy, with sitting up almost two whole nights before, that he wished to be relieved of the entertainment altogether. Saving the situation with a jest, Bacon ventured to entreat his Majesty that by this difference he would not, as it were, bury them quick; to which the King replied that then they must bury him quick, for he could last no longer; but he graciously appointed them to come again on the following Saturday.

Some of the facts relating to the river procession are taken from the autobiography of Phineas Pette, one of the King's master shipwrights, who was commissioned to provide the vessels for the sea fight, which preceded the presentation of the masque. The manuscript is printed in "Archæologia," Vol. XII., and on page 266 is the following entry:—

"After the sea service was performed, I was entreated by divers gentlemen of the Inns of business, *whereof Sir Francis Bacon was chief*, to attend the bringing of a mask by water in the night from S. Mary Over's to Whitehall in some gallies; but the tide falling out very contrary, and the company attending the masquers very unruly, the project could not be performed so exactly as was purposed. But yet they were safely landed at the plying stairs at Whitehall, for which my pains the gentlemen gave me a fair recompence."

As on the "night of errors" at Gray's Inn in 1594, the players were crowded out and disappointed, while the discouraging welcome given them by the King was enough to make them abandon the entertainment. "The grace of their masque is quite gone," Chamberlain writes, "when their apparel hath been already showed and their devices vented, so that how it will fall out God knows, for they are much discouraged and out of

countenance, and the world says it comes to pass after the old proverb, 'The properer man the worse luck.'"

But the temper of the "chief contriver" revealed itself in his dealings with men, and by adapting himself to their moods and humours. Moreover, his devices were more than the mere exhibition of the players and their apparel, "and there was novelty enough behind the curtain to make a sufficient entertainment by itself, without the water business for overture." Accordingly, the masquers proceeded again to Westminster on the Saturday, "and performed their parts exceeding well and with great applause and approbation from the King and all the company." The next night they were invited by the King to a supper in the new marriage room, "where they were well treated and much graced with kissing his Majesty's hand, and every one having a particular *accoglienza* from him."

A copy of this masque, with all particulars as to scenery, dresses, and stage arrangements, may be seen in any edition of Beaumont and Fletcher.

In the following year, when Bacon was Attorney-General, his enthusiasm for dramatic entertainments was marked by his lavish expenditure in providing "the Masque of Flowers" presented before the King in the Banqueting House at Whitehall by the members of Gray's Inn. Bacon, we are told, not only prepared the masque, but insisted upon bearing the whole expense himself. The members of Gray's Inn proposed to subscribe to the cost, and Sir Henry Yelverton offered to contribute the sum of £500, but Bacon declined all contributions, and generously defrayed the expenses, amounting to the sum of at least £2,000, which, according to the present value of money, would represent about £10,000 at the present day.

In a letter of the 23rd December, 1613, Chamberlain writes:—

"Sir Francis Bacon prepares a masque to honour this marriage (the Earl of Somerset and Lady Francis), which will stand him in above £2,000, and although he has been offered some help by the House, and specially by Mr. Solicitor, Sir Henry Yelverton, who would have sent him £500, yet he would not accept it, but offers them the whole charge with the honour."

A copy of this masque was presented to the Society of Gray's Inn by one of its members in 1874. In the dedication to Sir Francis Bacon, it is stated, "You have graced in general all the societies of the Inns of Court, ... and particularly Gray's Inn, which as you have formerly brought to flourish both in the ancienter and younger sort, by countenancing virtue in every quality, so now you have made a notable demonstration thereof in the lighter and less serious kind."

Bacon's life, indeed, was a curious mixture of the serious and the gay. The philosopher had a generous sympathy with human nature, and realised that the common discourse with men is sometimes wiser than books. In the "Gesta Grayorum" may be seen his advice to the knights of the Order of the Helmet, that they should "frequent the theatre and such-like places of experience; and resort to the better sort of ordinaries for conference, whereby they may not only become accomplished with civil conversation and able to govern a table with discourse, but also sufficient, if need be, to make epigrams, emblems, and other devices appertaining to his Honour's learned revels."

Like Sir Andrew Aguecheek, Bacon might very well say of himself—

"I am a fellow o' the strangest mind i' the world; I delight in masques and revels sometimes altogether."

HAROLD HARDY.

"WILLOBIE—HIS AVISA."

A BOOK of verse, popular in its day, bearing the above title, was entered S.R. 3rd September and printed 1st October, 1594.

Modern reprints are due to its containing the first allusion in literature to the name Shakespeare:—

"And Shake-speare paints poore Lucrece rape."

Mr. Charles Hughes and Dr. Creighton have severally attempted solutions of the enigma of the poem's authorship and of the identity of the chaste lady in the case.

Mr. Hughes thinks Henry Willoughby, of West Knole, in Wilts, wrote the poem at the age of eighteen, or earlier, and that he met the play-actor in 1593, when the latter, possibly in the train of the young Earl Southampton, *was possibly* visiting Shaftsbury, where the Earl's only sister, Lady Thomas Arundel, may have resided.

Dr. Creighton believes that Henry Willobie was a myth, and that Earl Southampton, then aged twenty, wrote the poem. He, like Mr. Hughes, thinks the play-actor was the W. S. of the verses.

Mr. Hughes affirms the chaste lady to have been one Avice Forward, of Mere, in Wilts.

Dr. Creighton identifies her as Avis Yate, of Basingstoke, Hants, the Yate family being dependents of the Earl of Southampton.

Mr. Hughes cannot trace the "Hadrian Dorrell," the alleged discoverer and avowedly unauthorised publisher of the book. Dr. Creighton dismisses "Dorrell" as a myth, like Willobie.

I am not concerned in identifying the lady. She may have been either Avice Forward or Avis Yate. She may, as another critic once suggested, have been

merely a covert allusion to the first symbol of the biliteral cipher, viz., A 5 is A—that is to say, A.A.A.A.A. (as the illustration of the cipher in "De Augmentis" shows), being the cipher symbol of the letter A of any interior story.

Avisa, as "Dorrell," in reply to his critics in 1596, averred, may only have been an idealization of the virtue Chastity. I am, however, wishful to ascertain who wrote the poem, and I agree with Mr. Sidney Lee that "Dorrell" did so (see "Dict. Nat. Biography," title, Henry Willobie). "Dorrell" was the writer of the poem, dedications, and laudatory verses, and "Dorrell" was, I feel assured, merely one of the many pseudonyms of Francis Bacon. That Francis wrote the Shakespeare plays and poems is common ground with all members of the Bacon Society.

Earl Southampton was the only surviving son and heir to the vast estates of his father, who died when the boy was only eight years of age. During his minority —1581 to 1594—he was a Ward of Court, and the income of his estates must have accumulated to a considerable sum. From 1589 he was a student at Gray's Inn, opposite to which his large mansion and grounds were situated. Francis and he were thus close neighbours, and it may not be too much to assume that the Earl studied law in Bacon's chambers, or under his direction.

Francis, in 1593, at the age of thirty-two, in the full joy of his poetical powers, had great faith in his ability, through his poems, to hand down to all time the names and fames of his friends. What more natural that when his mask, the player Marlowe, died in June, 1593, he should induce a new-comer in his mother the Queen's company of players—Shakspere—to let him use his name in July for the *Venus and Adonis*, then printed,

and which he wanted to dedicate to his protégé, the young Earl?

The suggestion in the dedication that the lines were "unpolished," and that the player would "take advantage of *all idle houres* till I have honoured you with some graver labour," is amusing as insinuating that Shakspere's employment as a player occupied the bulk of his time! We shall never know to what extent Southampton, out of his accumulated wealth, helped Francis during 1594 while the latter was forbidden the Court and hard pressed for money. The obligation must have been considerable, having regard to the warmth of his dedication to the Earl of *Lucrece* in 1594, and to the assertion in the dedication to the Earl of *Jack Wilton* also in 1594, but published under the vizard of Nashe: "A new wit a new stile, a new soule will I get me to canonize your name to posteritie."

Let us assume that Southampton, discussing the virtuous behaviour of Lucrece, extolled, as equally constant and chaste, the behaviour of an innkeeper's wife or daughter known to him in the west of England, and that Francis resolved to celebrate it in verse. He would seek for another more appropriate pseudonym, and probably the name of some young page just sent to reside abroad upon Her Majesty's service was selected.

The internal evidence of the poem and dedications of "Willobie—His Avisa," support the assumption of Bacon's authorship.

The hand that wrote the dedication in *Lucrece*, 1594: "*What I have done is yours what I have to do is yours being part in all I have devoted yours.* Were my worth greater my *duty* would shew greater, *meantime*, as it is, is bound to your Lordship," also wrote the first dedication in "Avisa" in the same year: "*Whatsoever is in me I have vowed it wholy to the exalting of the glory of*

your sweete sex as time occasion and ability shall permit. In the *meantime* I rest *yours* in all *dutyfull affection.*"

The dedications and prose in "Avisa," and in the 1596 "Apology," are entirely Baconian in character.

Catch the lilt of this passage: "Pleasant without hardnesse, smooth without any roughnesse, sweet without tediousnesse, easie to be understood, without harrish absurdity: yielding a gratious harmony everywhere to the delight of the reader."

Consider another: "But I see that as it happeneth in the distemperature of the body, so it often fareth in the disorders of the minde: for the body being oppressed with the venemous malice of some predominate humor, the seate of judgment, which is the taste, is corrupted."

"Dorrell" writes: "I have not added or detracted anything from the worke it selfe but have let it passe without altering anything."

Bacon wrote: "I alter ever when I add."

The scholarship of the author of "Avisa," like that of Bacon, was wide. He shows knowledge of the works of Plato, Aristotle, Pindar, Musæus, Plutarch, Homer, Mantuanus, Eusebius, and Josephus, and evidently many other of the classical writers. He freely quoted Italian, and was familiar with Sir Thomas More's "Utopia," Sidney's "Arcadia," and Spenser's "Færie Queene." Moreover, he was fully versed in the Bible.

The author had the same love of weak puns betrayed in Bacon's writings under other vizards. He puns on *rara avis*, paine and pen, queens and queans. The poem is dotted with expressions one feels to be very familiar with in Baconian vizarded writings:—

I cannot tell	Paint the rose
Wiser sort	Smokie sighs
Best sort	Hollow sighs

Greatest sort	Flying fame
Fancies bred	Seas of grief
Stormie blasts	A thousand times, etc.

The author betrays a trained knowledge of law:—

"For further *trial* of my faith
And rather make *some wise delay*
. . . .
And though I be by *Jury cast*
. . . .
And though I be *condemned* at last."
. . . .
"Inquire of me and *take the vewe*
Of mine estate with good advise
. . . .
Of this I will *assurance* make
. . . .
That this *in trust* from me shall *take*
While thou dost live unto thy use.
. . . .
Where nature *granteth* such a face
I need not doubt to *purchase* grace."

Parallelisms are usually accepted as very decisive on authorship questions when Bacon's claims are not in controversy. The following show close renderings of the same lines of thought:—

1. "The lymed bird by fowlers traine."

This simile appears in *The Spanish Tragedy*, 1594, and in Bacon's letter to Greville of the same year.

2. "When she doth laugh you must be glad
And watch occasions tyme and place."
—W. A.

"He must observe the moods of those on whom he jests
The quality of persons and the time."
—Shakespeare.

Bacon gives a similar warning.

3. "Its hard to love and to be wise."
—W. A.

Bacon uses this in Spenser :—

"To be wise and eke to love
Is granted scarce to God above."

Also in Shakespeare :—

"For to be wise and love
Exceeds man's might ; that dwells with God above."

4. "A spotless name is more to me
Then wealth then friends then life can be."
—W. A.

Compare Othello :—

"Good name in man or woman dear my Lord
Is the most precious jewel of our souls
Who steals my purse steals trash."

5. "I saw your gardens passing fyne
With pleasant flowers lately dect
With cowslips and with eglantine
When wofull woodbine lyes reject."
—W. A.

Compare Shakespeare :—

"Where oxlips and the nodding violet grows
. . . .
Just overcanopied with luscious woodbine
With sweet musk roses and with eglantine."

6. "You look so pale with Lented cheeks
Your wanny face and *sharpened nose.*"
—W. A.

Compare Shakespeare :—

"How pale and wan he looks !"

Also the description of Falstaff's death in *Henry V.*:—

"His nose was as sharp as a pen."

Also Bacon :—

"The nose becoming sharp, the face pallid."
—*History of Life and Death.*

I think there is no reasonable doubt that Francis Bacon, the young poet of thirty-three, wrote the poem of "Willobie—His Avisa," and that in this book he first speculated with the use of the hyphen between the combined words making up the idealized name Shake-speare. He used the hyphen on the title-pages of the reprints of *Richard II.*, 1598, *Richard III.*, 1598, and *Henry IV.*, 1599, but only intermittently afterwards.

PARKER WOODWARD.

BOHEMIA ON THE SEA COAST.

THE ascription shelterers affirm that Bacon, as a learned and much-travelled man, could not have committed the geographical solecism in *The Winter's Tale* of placing Bohemia on the sea coast. *Ergo*, that the native genius from Stratford was likely to have made such a blunder, and consequently was the true author of the plays ascribed to him.

They do not explain how the native genius became aware that Giulio Romano, the painter, was also a sculptor. But that is another story.

The Bohemia crudity seems to have been discussed amongst Bacon's literary *entourage*. It troubled Ben Jonson in 1618, but by the time he wrote his "Discoveries" his doubt must have been resolved.

John Taylor, the water poet, did not think this solecism at all serious. In his "Travels to Prague," 1620, he said it was not a piece of very unusual ignorance in an Alderman of London not to be aware that a fleet of ships could not arrive at a port of Bohemia.

Of course, Francis Bacon knew a good deal about the great and ancient Kingdom of Bohemia. From his "Notes on the States of Christendom" he seems to

have personally visited the Austrian Court and probably passed through Prague.

But not long after the visit he wrote, under another vizard (the name of Robert Greene), a tale entitled "Pandosto," which he printed in 1588, and in this tale the error, if error it be, was first committed.

The critics remind us *ad nauseam* that *The Winter's Tale* was founded upon "Pandosto." But they do not tell us whether "Pandosto" itself was an original tale or was derived from an earlier source.

The author of the tale, whether Francis or some person further back in literary history, required for its purposes two kings and two kingdoms separated by the sea, but sufficiently near for occasional Court visits and sufficiently far as to make the possibility of the prolonged loss of a king's daughter reasonably plausible.

In the 13th century Sicily and Bohemia best fulfilled these conditions. Sicily had then kings of its own, and the enterprise of Ottakar II. of Bohemia had given his dominions seaports on the Adriatic.

Ottakar was defeated and killed in 1278, but while the boundaries of the old *kingdom* remained much about the same, the dominions of the Bohemian kings were vastly enlarged down to the end of the 15th century. It became proverbial that nothing could be done in the world without the help of God and of the king of Bohemia. So great a reputation would subsist through the ages, and when a London Alderman sent ships to the north-eastern ports of the Adriatic he considered that they were going to the coast of Bohemia. That such was the popular description of the part of the Adriatic coast dominated by this old, large, rich, and ascendant kingdom of Bohemia is confirmed by the European author, Tschamer, who, writing the "Annals of the Barefooted Friars" as late as 1654, stated that in 1481 "fourteen pilgrims, after being attacked by

Corsairs, landed at Bohemia." Austria was only a duchy, although it possessed the crowns of Bohemia and Hungary.

When Francis wrote his beautiful allegorical play of *The Tale of Winter*, illustrating (as Mr W. F. C. Wigston so ably shows) the myth of the sleeping Earth awaiting the return of its lost Spring child to restore it to life again, he made use of his "Pandosto" tale. A Bohemian sea coast was not a solecism in the days of the Middle Ages in which the story of the kings of Sicily and Bohemia was set. Nor was there need in the play to alter the statement.

Neither was the Giulio Romano reference an incongruity. The characters and *mise en scene* of the play were allegorical only, used for illustrating the passion of jealousy through all its causes and symptoms; used too in depicting the separation of Matter and Spirit and their eventual reconciliation—the central doctrine of the Eleusinian Mysteries.

"Pandosto" had probably a more purely personal object. It was stated to show "that although by the means of sinister fortune truth may be concealed, yet by Time, in spight of fortune, it is most successfully revealed." Upon its title page was the motto, *Temporis filia Veritas*—Truth the Daughter of Time.

The *tale* was probably written to indicate Francis Bacon's plans for the eventual revelation of the truth concerning his work and rightful heritage. In some respects the *play* of *The Winter's Tale* may allude to the same plans and expectations, but its general scale is vaster and higher. The progress of revealment may be slow, but it is sure, though incidentally one has to turn aside to those who, while swallowing the Romano camel strain at the Bohemia gnat.

PARKER WOODWARD.

THE STRATFORD GRAVESTONE.

WE may occasionally find it worth while to hunt upon an old scent — in the present instance that of the biliteral cipher in the inscription on the Stratford gravestone of the lines which in modern spelling would run :—

> Good friend for Jesus' sake forbear
> To dig the dust enclosed here ;
> Blest be the man that spares these stones
> And curst be he that moves my bones.

The first person to strike the scent was Mr. Hugh Black, of Ontario, who wrote an article in the *North American Review* for October, 1887, in which he advanced the view that the original inscription was cut in biliteral cipher letters. Mr. Black copied the inscription, he says, from Knight's edition of Shakespeare's Works. He does not specify which of Knight's editions, but the inscription is to be found both in the biography volume of Knight's Pictorial Edition (published 1839—1842), p. 535, and in Knight's Imperial Edition (published 1873—1876), Vol. II., app., p. 184, in the form in which Mr. Black gives it, that is to say—

> GOOD FREND FOR JESUS SAKE FORBEARE
> TO DIGG T—E DUST ENCLOASED HE.RE.
> BLESE BE T—E MAN $\overset{T}{Y}$ SPARES T—ES STONES
> AND CURST BE HE $\overset{T}{Y}$ MOVES MY BONES.

Knight calls the inscription an "extraordinary" one, but does not attempt to give a reason for its odd lettering. Mr. Black, however, was led by its appearance to think of Bacon's biliteral cipher, and when he found that the whole inscription consisted of 110 letters, *i.e.*, 22 groups of 5 letters each, and that when each large letter was regarded as a *b* and each small letter as an *a*,

as explained in the "De Augmentis," each group yielded one of the letters of Bacon's alphabet, and there were no biliteral letters left over, he had made a discovery of the highest importance; for in view of the above facts it cannot be doubted that the inscription was cut in Bacon's biliteral cipher—the cipher which he has told us he invented when at Paris in his youth, but which he did not publish until seven years after it had been used on this gravestone. Bacon's cipher on Shakspere's grave! What explanation can be given that will leave the Stratfordian creed unshaken. If Shakspere was under Bacon's control we could account for the existence of the cipher, but (as Mr. Donnelly says) "if Shakspere was Shakespeare he would have had no secret to reveal in a cipher." Who but Bacon could have instigated and arranged the use of the cipher? and why should Bacon have done so if the Stratford man was all that Stratford believes! The existence of the cipher is an immensely cogent fact in itself.

I have paused for a moment to emphasize the importance of the mere existence of Bacon's cipher on Shakspere's grave, irrespective of what may be read in it; but I will now return to Mr. Black and his attempt to decipher, and it will be convenient to notice at the same time the early part (Book I.) of Mr. Donnelly's small work called "The Cipher in the Plays and on the Tombstone," which was founded on Mr. Black's article.

Mr. Donnelly, while properly giving Mr. Black credit for being "the first man in the space of two hundred and seventy-one years who had perceived a relationship between Bacon's cipher and the inscription on Shakspere's tombstone at Stratford," thought that Mr. Black had not read the cipher as well as it might have been read, and set to work himself with the view of deciphering it better.

Mr. Black presented his 22 letters thus:—

S	A E H		R
B	A Y E		E P
R	F T A		X A
R	A W A		R

He pointed out that the letters above a line which he drew spelled *Shaxpeare*, and from the other letters he constructed the fragments of words which gave title to his article, "*Fra Ba wrt ear ay*," which form, he says, suggestive parts of the sentence, "*Francis Bacon wrote Shakespeare's Plays.*"

Mr. Donnelly rightly concluded that this was not an adequate or satisfactory solution—the fragments of words not being sufficiently conclusive.

Before commencing his own decipher Mr. Donnelly notes that objection had been raised to Mr. Black's article on the ground that in the present inscription there is no mixing of large and small letters, and provides a useful answer to this objection by quoting from Halliwell-Phillips' "Outlines of the Life of Shakespeare," with reference to the substitution of a new stone when the original one had been worn out :—"The honours of repose which have thus far been conceded to the poet's remains have not been extended to the tombstone. The latter had, by the middle of the last century, sunk below the level of the floor, and about fifty * years ago had become so much decayed as to suggest a vandalic order for its removal, and in its stead to place a new slab—one which marks certainly the locality of Shakespeare's grave, and continues the record of the farewell lines, but indicates nothing more. The original memorial has wandered from its allotted station, no one

* Mr. Donnelly quoted from the 2nd edition (1882), but in the 4th edition (1884) and subsequent editions Mr. Halliwell-Phillips substituted "ninety" for "fifty," presumably after more careful investigation.

can tell whither—a sacrifice to the insane worship of prosaic neatness, that mischievous demon whose votaries have practically destroyed so many of the priceless relics of ancient England and her gifted sons." But for Halliwell-Phillips I have little doubt that official Stratford would assert that the present stone is the original one and that no more has been done than to cut the original letters deeper when necessary, for this is what I find in the official guide to the Collegiate Church of Stratford-on-Avon (1907): "The next is the stone which according to unbroken tradition covers the poet's remains. The lines upon it, which have naturally required to be cleaned and deepened in the lapse of years, are: 'Good frend,' &c."

On one of my visits to Stratford-on-Avon the suggestion that cleaning and deepening the old letters was all that had ever been done was verbally made to me. I said, "Do you say, in spite of Steevens, Malone and Knight, that there never was anything in the nature of an unusual mixture of large and small letters in the inscription? If you do, how do you account for the evidence to the contrary of these three disinterested observers, and on what grounds do you ask me to disbelieve them? And if you do not say that, but do say that the present inscription is only the old one cut a little deeper, which are the small letters in the present inscription?" No solution of this dilemma was forthcoming.

With regard to Malone and Steevens, the versions they give us may be found in Johnson and Steevens, 4th edition (1793), Vol. I., p. 32; Malone (1790), Vol. I., part 1, p. 129; and Malone (1821), Vol. II., p. 506; and to these the reader is referred. In each of the above is found the expression "an uncouth mixture of small and capital letters," and letters capital in form are not used except for the *b* letters. It may, however, be remarked

that it is not certain that the expression "small" letters means letters that are small in form. The distinction between letters of the height of small letters and those of the height of capitals may possibly have been the distinction intended to be described.

In any case, I feel sure that the inscription as originally cut did not present such an ostentatiously bizarre appearance as Knight's, Steevens' and Malone's representations would lead one to suppose. If it had done so the cipher would have compelled notice instead of eluding it, and it may be gathered from Bacon's explanation of the cipher that the two kinds of letters used should be sufficiently distinguishable for a careful observer to be able to distinguish them, without being so different as to compel the notice of everybody. The exaggerated eccentricity of the versions in question probably arises from the fact that instead of having a drawing of the inscription we have attempts to represent the two sorts of letters by the use of ordinary type in which there is a great difference between the height of the small letters and that of the capitals. For instance, the "SAKE" that Steevens and Knight saw on the gravestone was probably much nearer to the height of the letters in "forbeare" than it looks in the version their printers give us. I must not let this digression run to greater length. I merely want to impress on the reader that the *a*'s and *b*'s could be, and doubtless were, distinguished in the original inscription without the difference being made as absurdly striking as it is in the printed copies we have.

I think Mr. Donnelly makes some mistakes in his Chapter IV. as to the authorities for the respective variant readings he discusses, and I have never found any authority for the dash he alleges in "Enclo—Ased."

I wrote to BACONIANA ten years ago asking if any one could refer me to an authority for this dash, but without eliciting any reply.

Having reviewed and compared the different versions of the inscription and quoted Bacon's explanation of his cipher in the "De Augmentis," Mr. Donnelly sets to work to decipher, ultimately evolving by processes he details in about forty pages, the sentence, "*Francis Bacon wrote the Greene, Marlowe, and Shakespeare Playes.*"

This result cannot, like Mr. Black's, be objected to as inadequate; but in my opinion there is not a single word of it that is legitimately deducible from the cipher writing. That I say after long and full consideration, undertaken in the hope of being able to accept and support Mr. Donnelly's solution. To explain in detail why I think his solution cannot be accepted, I should require more space than he occupied in advancing it, so I must leave the matter with this expression of my opinion.

Now, where do we find ourselves after Mr. Donnelly's failure to improve on Mr. Black's solution? We are not left nowhere, for Mr. Black did, in my opinion, establish the existence of the cipher. Let us return to Mr. Black and accept his suggestion that the biliteral gives us the letters that spell *Shaxpeare*, though I do not myself attach any importance to Mr. Black's imaginary line, or care whether the letters of *Shaxpeare* come from one side of it or from both sides. But I should be disposed myself, before going further, to take the W from the bottom line of his table to make *W. Shaxpeare*, as I think it more probable that Bacon would have referred in cipher to *W. Shaxpeare* than to *Shaxpeare*.

Where do we stand now? *W. Shaxpeare* is 10 letters, and there are 22 letters in all, so we have 12 left, and that is just the number that would make *Francis Bacon*, and Mr. Black has already pointed out that we can get *Fra Ba* out of the remaining letters. That is something to start with. If the letters besides FRABA were NCISCON our task would be over, and we should have

shown that the application of Bacon's cipher to the inscription on Shakspeare's grave produced the letters of *W. Shaxpeare* and *Francis Bacon*, and how could that be explained consistently with the Stratfordian creed?

But Mr. Black took the remaining seven letters to be YETRAAR. Has he made any mistakes or can he have been misled by imperfections in the copy he worked by? Can we verify his deciphering? Where shall we begin?

To bring the matter to a head as quickly as possible, let us see if there are any of Mr. Black's letters that could not under any circumstances be used in spelling *Francis Bacon*, because if there are any such, and no reason can be found for altering them, our hopes of success are gone.

The only two of the twelve that could not under any circumstances be used in spelling *Francis Bacon* are Y and T.

Now as to the Y. I remember at once that in the 1793 edition of Johnson and Steevens, the first T—E is distinctly lighter than the second and third. I made a note of this some years ago with the idea that the difference between light and dark signified the difference between an *a* and a *b*. If the first T—E is regarded as an *a* fount T—E, the result is that the Y becomes a C. The Y, therefore, ceases to be a difficulty, and it may be noticed that when it is replaced by a C in Mr. Black's table, his second line of letters begins with BAC. The SAEHR of the first line, and the BAC of the second, then give useful hints as to the words the cipher is to yield us.

With regard to the T, if the $\overset{T}{Y}$ before "spares" were an *a*, and the initial s of "spares" were a *b*, the T would be an S. We should have *baaab* instead of *baaba*, and a letter that will do instead of one that will not do. But

I fear we have no sufficient reason to give for making the $\overset{T}{Y}$ an *a*. It is true that Mr. Black's reason for making it (and similarly also the later one) a *b* is a very poor one. He says he reckons $\overset{T}{Y}$ as a single large letter because the T is placed exactly over the Y, which is not a reason that would lead us to think he had had much experience in deciphering biliteral, and, indeed, we have no ground for thinking he had ever had the opportunity of trying to decipher any other biliteral than this, and very likely he had not. If biliteral had been the subject of as much notice and discussion before 1887 as it has during the last ten years or so, I think Mr. Black would have felt that the system must provide for distinguishing a $\overset{T}{Y}$ which is an *a* from a $\overset{T}{Y}$ which is a *b*, and that the distinction would probably be effected by making the *a* one lighter or smaller than the other. If that was done in this case, our copyists did not notice it, or else did not record it, and as the original has disappeared and we have only copies which treat both the $\overset{T}{Y}$'s alike, we are at the end of our tether. Of course it is not to be wondered at that copyists who knew nothing of biliteral should have failed in some cases to notice the slight differences by which the *a* letters might be distinguished from the *b* letters. On the other hand, it is wonderful that they have enabled us to distinguish the *a*'s from the *b*'s in as many instances as they have. There are 110 letters in the whole inscription, and to make the EAARR the remaining letters we have into the NNICO, which would enable us to spell *Francis Bacon*, only nine or ten corrections of *a*'s and *b*'s would be required. That is to say, copies made without having the biliteral cipher in view, and without knowledge of it, or of the importance of exactitude, or of *a* founts and *b* founts, have distinguished the *a*'s and *b*'s correctly in 100 cases as

against failure to do so in but ten cases. The ten cases are evidently in the latter part of the inscription. The copyist would probably be more careful when he began than he would be as he went on. His attention would be likely to flag in the tedious endeavour to copy eccentricities in which he did not suppose there was any definite object. He would not feel that it was of importance to be accurate in every instance, provided he gave a fair sample of the inscription. Twenty-five large letters would justify his statement that there was "an uncouth mixture" as well as thirty-five would.

I should therefore expect that the first part of the inscription would be more perfectly copied than the last part, and the view that it is so is confirmed by the fact that when the attempt is made to read the biliteral cipher in verses not written in biliteral, the result is to produce an undue proportion of A's and R's,* and that is just what Mr. Black gets from the last two lines. His last line of letters is RAWAR, and he has an R and two A's in the third line. The inference to be drawn is that in the latter part of the inscription the copyists failed to indicate some of the large letters. The *b*'s they overlooked would probably have given us the letters we require.

Without the original, however, we can only conjecture and surmise, and there is all the difference in the world for controversial purposes between conjecture and demonstration. I have no doubt myself, and I do not think many Baconians will doubt, that if the original inscription had been in existence, we should have been able to show the world that the application of Bacon's cipher to Shakspere's gravestone produced exactly the twenty-two letters that spell *W. Shaxpeare* and *Francis*

* The reason is obvious, and an example may be seen at pages 27 and 28 of Mr. Donnelly's book, where he tries whether the cipher will apply to the lines "Stay, Passenger," &c.

Bacon. But, most unfortunately, the original inscription is not available, and without it I fear we cannot get further than I have above indicated.

G. B. ROSHER.

SHAKESPEARE, BACON, AND THE GREAT UNKNOWN.

THERE will be a general feeling of deep regret amongst Baconians that the author of this book did not live to see its publication. In the preface to it, written by Mrs. Andrew Lang, it is stated that although it was in type before her husband's death, he "had no time even to correct the first proofs, and doubtless he would have made many changes, if not in his views, at least in the expression of them." This feeling of regret is accentuated by the fact that Mr. Lang endeavours fairly and squarely, to the extent of his knowledge, to meet many of the arguments advanced by Baconians against the Stratford authorship. Mr. Lang was an uncompromising opponent of the theory of the Baconian authorship of the Shakespeare plays. He describes the position of the controversy in these terms :—"But the Baconian theory is universally rejected in England by the professors and historians of English literature; and generally by students who have no profession save that of Letters. The Baconians, however, do not lack the countenance and assistance of highly-distinguished persons, whose names are famous where those of men of Letters are unknown; and in circles where the title of 'Professor' is not duly respected." Judges Holmes, Webb, and Lord Penzance and Mark Twain amongst others are referred to in this last sentence; but the author refuses to "regard them as,

in the first place and professionally, trained students of literary history." It was Mr. G. G. Greenwood's "The Shakespeare Problem Re-stated" and his later works that caused Mr. Lang to take a part in the controversy. He considers Mr. Greenwood to be worth fighting, cunning of fence, and learned, a man of sense, with a knowledge of Elizabethan literature.

Mr. Lang devotes his book entirely to answering certain arguments against the Stratford authorship put forward by Mr. Greenwood, and *only certain* of his arguments. Here and there are references to some of the arguments advanced by others in favour of the Bacon authorship and objections are raised as to its possibility, but these are digressions. The author does not consider any Baconian worthy of his steel, but Mr. Greenwood is different. "The Shakespeare Problem Re-stated" he considers beyond comparison the best work on the anti-Willian side of the controversy. So to answer this he addresses himself. But Mr. Greenwood does not profess to state the case urged on behalf of the Bacon authorship. Further, he explicitly disclaims a belief in that theory. The position he takes up is that William Shakspere, of Stratford, did not write the plays and poems. To the question, "Who then was the author?" he replies, "I cannot tell." So Mr. Lang does not get an opportunity of seriously examining the Baconian theory. Nor from this point of view is it incumbent upon him that he should do so. He proves to his own satisfaction that the Stratford man, who up to about fifty years ago held undisputed possession of the authorship, did write the plays and poems, so there is no need to consider the claims put forward on behalf of any other.

It would be impossible in the space here available to follow the arguments urged, always with fairness, by Mr. Lang. It is probable that they will in due course

be dealt with by Mr. Greenwood, who is ever ready for an encounter on this subject. A reply could not be in better hands. But it may not be amiss to point out certain fundamental propositions upon which Mr. Lang goes astray, and which really deprive his general line of argument of any weight. Mr. Lang assumes that there is contemporary evidence, outside the 1623 Folio Edition, that the Stratford man was the author of the plays and poems, but he does not advance any evidence in support of this. He writes on page xxvii.:

"The evidence for the contemporary faith in Will's authorship is all positive; from his own age comes not a whisper of doubt, not even a murmur of surprise. It is incredible to me that his fellow-actors and fellow-playwrights should have been deceived, especially when they were such men as Ben Johnson and Tom Haywood."

On page 18:

"There does not exist the most shadowy hint proving that the faintest doubt was thrown on the actor's authorship; ignorant as he was bookless and rude of speech."

On page 23:

"But in Elizabeth's time the few [playgoers] who cared were apt to care very much, and they would inquire intensely when the Stratford actor, a bookless, untaught man, was announced as the author of plays which were amongst the most popular of their day. The seekers never found any other author. They left no hint that they suspected the existence of any other author. Hence I venture to infer that Will seemed to them no unread rustic, but a fellow of infinite fancy—no scholar, to be sure, but very capable of writing the pieces which he fathered."

On page 30:

"To be puzzled by and found theories on the silence about Shakespeare is to show an innocence very odd in learned disputants."

On page 156:

"The more a man was notorious as was Will Shakespeare the actor, the less the need for any critic to tell his public 'who Shakespeare was.'"

This theme is harped on throughout the book. It is the fundamental argument relied on. But there is no evidence apart from the verses and preface prefixed to the 1623 Folio Edition, quoted in support of it. Nor could any be quoted, for it does not exist.

Against Mr. Lang's assumption, and it is a pure assumption, may be called three men of letters, two of them amongst the most eminent of Shakesperean scholars, neither of whom had been contaminated by any trace of Baconianism; the third, a man of letters, a philosopher, with a world-wide reputation. Richard Grant White, in "Memoirs of William Shakespeare," p. cxi., writes—

"Of his eminent countrymen, Raleigh, Sydney, Spencer, Bacon, Cecil, Walsingham, Coke, Camden, Hooker, Drake, Hobbes, Inigo Jones, Herbert of Cherbury, Laud, Pym, Hampden, Seldon, Walton, Wotton, and Donne, may be properly reckoned as his contemporaries, and yet there is no evidence whatever that he was personally known to either of these men or to any others of less note among the statesmen, scholars, soldiers, and artists of his day, excepting a few of his fellow-craftsmen."

Dr. G. M. Ingleby * writes—

"The prose works published in the latter part of the sixteenth and the early part of the seventeenth centuries contain abundant notices of every poet of distinction save Shakespeare, whose name and works are rarely and only slightly mentioned. . . . . It is plain that the bard of our admiration was unknown to the men of that age."

* Dr. Ingleby was the compiler of "Shakespeare's Centurie of Prayer." In preparing this work he devoted more than two years exclusively to hunting through the literature from 1593 to 1693 for allusions to Shakespeare. His testimony is therefore of special value.

Emerson writes—

"Since the constellation of great men who appeared in Greece in the time of Pericles, there never was any such society; yet their genius failed them to find out the best head in the universe."

Now the testimony of these three men far outweighs the assumption of Mr. Andrew Lang, who thus endeavours to minimize Dr. Ingleby's words:—"When Dr. Ingleby says that 'the bard of our admiration was unknown to the men of that age,' he uses hyperbole, and means, I presume, that he was unknown, as all authors are, to the great majority; and that those who know him in part made no modern fuss about him." If Mr. Lang had read *the whole* of Dr. Ingleby's statement he could not have suggested such a presumption. But the opinions of other distinguished scholars are opposed to those of this author. Mr. Lang labours the hackneyed remarks of Robert Greene as to the *Johannes Factotum* and *Shake-scene*. Greene never mentions by name either the Stratford man or William Shakespeare the poet, but there are remarks made by him upon which Mr. Lang relies as evidence that the Stratford man and the poet were one and the same. Thomas Simpson's "The School of Shakespeare" may be termed a classic. The writer was a man of letters. He adopts the view that it was to the Stratford man that Greene referred in the "Groatsworth of Wit" and elsewhere; he deals with the subject exhaustively. The conclusion to which he arrives is this:—"Throughout we see Greene's determination not to recognize Shakspeare as a man capable of doing anything by himself." Mr. Simpson's investigation shows the existence of more than "the most shadowy hint proving that the faintest doubt existed" as to the Stratford man being the author of works attributed to him, if they were so attributed.

Another assumption of Mr. Lang is that the plays

attracted public attention and were popular. On page 31 he says:—

"He was popular on the stage."

On page 159:—

"It appears to me that Shakespeare's Company would be likely, as his plays were very popular," etc.

This is an unsupported affirmation. There is another assumption, equally without foundation, which in effect is implied in the foregoing, and it is that the plays were written for and performed at the public theatres of the period. Mr. Lang has not investigated his subject from first-hand sources. He relies on books which he has looked up written by partizans. His remarks recently quoted on Dr. Ingleby's statement may be instanced in support of this view. There is only evidence that two or three plays bearing the same titles as plays of Shakespeare were produced at the public theatres—there is no evidence that any one of Shakespeare's plays *as printed* was so produced. But there is overwhelming evidence that they were unfitted for such production and would not have been tolerated by the audiences. Anyone who has made himself acquainted from original sources of information with the conditions under which the public theatres were conducted, the entertainments which were produced at them, and the audiences which frequented them, can come to no other decision.

There is another assumption not supported by any evidence. Mr. Lang writes on page 15:

"A concealed poet . . . might obtain the manuscript copies from their owners, the Lord Chamberlain's Company, etc."

On page 31:

"We cannot be sure that he and his Company in fact did not provide publishers with the copy for the better quartos," etc.

On page 34:

"Probably the Company gave a good MSS. copy sometimes to a printer who offered satisfactory terms after the gloss of novelty was off the acted play."

On page 133:

"The story of the 'Concealed Poet,' who really, at first, did the additions and changes on the Company's older plays."

On page 164:

"The plays by the original authors, whoever they were, could only be obtained by the 'Concealed Poet' and man in high position from the legal owners, Shakespeare's Company usually."

It is a pure assumption, not supported by a scrap of evidence, that any one of Shakespeare's plays was at any time the property of any company of actors. There is no evidence that any company of players either owned the rights of any of the Shakespeare plays or were in any way interested in any copyright. But the book is full of such statements, which have no other authority than Mr. Lang's word. Here is an example:—

"We are sure that Will got money for them, but we do not know what arrangement he made with his company."

It is pure conjecture that the author ever made one shilling by either the printing or acting of the plays. There is no historical fact recorded to support this conjecture.

Reviewers of the book point out that there is nothing new in the way of evidence in Mr. Lang's contribution to the question at issue. But there is a considerable addition to the wild speculations of the Shakespearean fold. So far as additional valid arguments against what he terms the anti-Willian, the author is really barren. Take away the assumptions unsupported by evidence and you have little left.

Turning very briefly to Mr. Lang's remarks about Francis Bacon, it is obvious that he knew nothing of

the man and had not read his works. Every reference to the great writer displays only a superficial acquaintance with either. Here is a sentence:

"But just because Bacon, at thirty-one, *is* so extremely 'green,' going to 'take all knowledge for his province' (if someone will only subsidise him and endow his research), I conceive that he was in earnest about his reformation of science."

Bacon was not "going to"; he said he *had* taken all knowledge to be his province. What he was "going to" do was this—not ruin himself by contemplation as did Anaxagoras, but sell his inheritance and buy some lease of quick revenue or some office of gain which could be executed by a deputy and become some sorry bookmaker and a pioneer in that mine of truth which he (Anaxagoras) said lay so deep. It was bookmaking, not scientific research, that he was seeking means to carry out.

Mr. Andrew Lang makes a great point of what he terms the errors in the plays, particularly the anachronisms. After reciting some of these, he says:

"Nobody will persuade me that Bacon was so charmingly irresponsible."

And again:

"How could a scholar do any of these things? He was as incapable of them as Ben Jonson. Such sins no scholar is inclined to; they have for him no temptation."

Referring to *Love's Labour Lost*, he says:

"Thus early we find that great scholar mixing up chronology in a way which in Shakespeare even surprises, but in Bacon seems quite out of keeping."

On page 282 he says:

"But why was Bacon so woefully inaccurate on points of scholarship and history?"

Bacon himself appears to have answered this criticism in anticipation. In the "Advancement of Learning" (1640), Book II., Chap. I., poesy is defined thus:—"By Poesy, in this place, we understand nothing else but feigned History or Fables. As for verse that is only a style of expression, and pertained to the Art of Elocution, of which in due place. Poesy, in that sense we have expounded it, is likewise of individuals, fancied to the similitude of those things which in true History are recorded, yet so as often it exceeds measure; and those things which in Nature would never meet nor come to pass, Poesy composeth and introduceth at pleasure, even as Painting doth, which indeed is the work of the Imagination."

In the Latin version (1623) poesy is spoken of as being "in measure of words for the most part restrained, but in all other points extremely free and licensed, and therefore it is referred to the Imagination which may at pleasure make unlawful matches and divorces of things."

The poet, though a scholar, is justified, in order to obtain the effect he seeks, to ignore what are termed *the unities*.

Chapter XIII. is devoted to "The Pre-occupations of Bacon." It abounds in mis-statements, inaccuracies and contradictions. Seldom has a man sat down to write upon a subject upon which he was so ill-informed as was Mr. Lang on the occupations of Bacon. He speaks of Bacon's "ceaseless scientific pre-occupation." Exactly what the phrase means it is impossible to say, but there is nothing recorded of his life between 1576 to 1605 which supports any possible interpretation which could be put upon it. He states that Bacon was much concerned with the cause of reformed religion —with the good government of his native country, which he could only aid by his services in Parliament, where,

despite his desire for advancement, he conscientiously opposed the Queen; he was obliged to work at such tasks of various sorts—legal and polemical literature—as were set him by people in power. And then comes this remarkable deduction:

"With these three great objects filling his heart, inspiring his ambition, and occupying his energies and time, we cannot easily believe without direct external evidence that he or any mortal could have leisure and detachment from his main objects (to which we may add his own advancement) sufficient to enable him to compose the works attributed to Shakespeare."

The "three great objects" are appropriated from Spedding, who, however, applies them to a purpose wholly different from that of Mr. Lang.

We know that Bacon was a rapid writer, for his "History of Henry VII." was not begun in June, 1621, and was finished in the following October, and of all Bacon's works this may be considered the one which would occupy more time per thousand words than any other, for it would necessitate more reference to authorities or original sources of information. But, accepting this as the average rate at which he would write, all Bacon's literary productions from 1580 to 1605—commencing with "Notes of the State of Christendom," written when he was on the Continent (1580-1) and a letter of advice to the Queen—a remarkable effusion for a boy of 24 years to address to his Sovereign, including the "Gesta Grayorum" (1594) and the first edition of the Essays (1597)—would not require at the outside for their production more than six months. A careful calculation of the time required for these—for his parliamentary duties, his practice as a lawyer so far as records exist—justifies the statement that the occupation of not more than two years out of the twenty-five are accounted for. This lack of adequate results for the most important years of his life would be

remarkable in an average literary man. But for the possessor of "the most exquisitely constructed intellect which was ever bestowed on any of the children of men," who "at 12 years of age in industry was above the capacity and in mind above the reach of his contemporaries," who, on account of his universal comprehension of things, was then "the observation of wise men, as he became afterwards the wonder of all"!—is it possible to conceive such a period of unproductiveness?

The charm of the Shakespeare plays lies in their spontaneity. They were no heavy tax on the time of the man, whoever he may have been who wrote them. Given the knowledge required, which in the author's case, according to Lowell, was in range and accuracy without precedent or later parallel, he could pour them out without effort. The writer of the article on Francis Bacon in the "Encyclopædia Britannica" describes his style as "quaint, original, abounding in allusions, witticisms, and rich even to gorgeousness with piled-up analogies and metaphors." No words could more accurately describe Shakespeare's style.

"The occupations, and even more the scientific pre-occupation [*whatever that means*—ED.] of Bacon, do not make his authorship of the plays a physical impossibility; but they make it an intellectual miracle."

They were that, whoever wrote them. But to whom is the miracle to be attributed? In Bacon are found all the qualifications required for the production of the poems and plays; the universal knowledge, the style of the writer—especially as to the prose portions, the existence of which Mr. Lang ignores—the legal experience, the versatility and wit, the love of punning, the imaginative faculty, the poetic imagery, the superb rhetoric (whoever wrote the plays was a consummate orator), the inconceivable wisdom, the philosophy, the

exquisite command of language—nothing is lacking, and he had the time to produce the works over and over again, and then ten times over. Of the Stratford man—Mr. Lang's "Will"—there is not "the most shadowy hint of the faintest" suggestion on the part of any contemporary recorded during his lifetime that he possessed a trace of any one of these qualifications. Some stronger term than "intellectual miracle" is required if this man was the author. A concealed poet indeed he was with a vengeance.

Mr. Lang describes Bacon's "Temporis Partus Maximus" as "his first essay on the Instauration of Philosophy." This description is not justified by the only words in which Bacon refers to the book in the letter to Father Fulgentia, written in 1625. The work has not come down to us, at any rate, under Bacon's name; but, whatever it may have been, it was not connected with the scheme of his Instauration.

On page 275 Mr. Lang writes:—

"Law is a hard mistress, rapacious of a man's hours."

He appears to be unaware that in 1594, when Bacon's appointment to the office of Attorney-General was being urged, he had never held a brief. He quotes a remark which Bacon made in 1604 when speaking of his connection with Essex in 1590-1: "I did nothing but advise and ruminate with myself to the best of my understanding, propositions and memorials of anything that might concern his Lordship's honour, fortune, or service." Mr. Lang comments:

"As Bacon did nothing but these things (1591-2), he had no leisure for writing poetry and plays." And again: 'We know that Bacon at this period did nothing but ruminate. The words are his own (1604).' No plays—no *Venus and Adonis*—nothing but enthusiastic service of Essex and the Sonnets."

It is difficult to have patience with such loose reason-

ing. From whence did Mr. Lang get authority for his statement that

"Some Baconians vow he (Bacon) wrote the Sonnets to Essex" (page 172)?

The references to this subject on pages 278-9 almost justify the inference that Mr. Lang considers this suggestion plausible. It is certainly no part of the Baconian belief.

No! "Shakespeare, Bacon, and the Great Unknown" will not add to the literary reputation of the late Mr. Andrew Lang. It might with advantage have been reduced by two-thirds; the iteration and reiteration is frequently tedious to the reader. It is the work of a journalist not by any means at his best. From this point of view it is the more to be regretted that, as Mrs. Lang says, he had not time to correct the proofs, or "doubtless he would have made many changes, if not in his views, at least in the expression of them." If not in his views? Does this suggest that after the copy had gone to the printer Mr. Lang may have had some doubts as to whether the case against the Bacon authorship was quite as strong as he had believed it to be?

W. T. Smedley.

THE TESTIMONY OF FLORIO.

WE are told quite clearly, if we are able to understand what we are told, that the plays known as Shakespeare's were in fact written by "a gentleman—a man of position—who loved better to be a poet than to be counted so."

In Florio's "Second Frutes," 1591, immediately after the address to the reader, there is a sonnet, "Phaeton to his friend Florio," which, it is admitted by Sir Sidney Lee, must have been written by "Shakespeare." I think that Dr. Munro was the first to discover that this was a "Shakespeare" sonnet (see the article "Shakespeare" in the old Encyclopædia Britannica). Well! what does Florio himself say about it? The sonnet appeared in his "Second Frutes," 1591, and he thus refers to it in "A World of Wordes," which is dated 1598: "There is another sort of leering curs, that rather snarle than bite, whereof I could instance in one, who lighting upon a good sonnet of a gentleman's, a friend of mine, that loved better to be a poet than to be counted so, called the auctor a rymer."

Here we see that Florio says most distinctly that the author of the sonnet which is addressed to himself "loved better to be a poet than to be counted so." But the author of that sonnet is admittedly the author of all the "Shakespeare" sonnets and admittedly also the author of the "Shakespeare" plays. Florio therefore tells us, in words the meaning of which it is not possible to mistake, that the mighty author of the plays was "a gentleman"—a man of position—"who loved better to be a poet than to be counted so."

Florio was always a servant of Bacon's and eventually received a pension of £50 per annum for making my Lord's works known abroad. It is absolutely impossible that Florio could have been alluding to the "Householder

of Stratford" when he said that the sonnet was written by "a gentleman" "who loved better to be a poet than to be counted so." The man of Stratford could have had no possible reason for desiring concealment if, indeed, he who could neither read nor write had been a poet. Furthermore, William Shakespeare, of Stratford-upon-Avon, did not become entitled to be styled "a gentleman" until he had obtained a coat-of-arms in 1599. In Ben Jonson's "Every Man out of his Humour" the clown who has bought a coat-of-arms appears upon the stage in Act III. and says: "I can write myself gentleman now here's my pattent." Writing in 1598, in reference to what had been printed in 1591, Florio could not have described the "essential clown," William Shakespeare, of Stratford-upon-Avon, as "a gentleman," "a friend of mine." If it were possible to imagine that Florio might have been friendly with the "essential clown," he would not have gone out of his way to say "a gentleman," "a friend of mine."

Bacon himself tells us that he loved better to be a poet than to be counted so, in his "Declaration of the Practices and Treasons attempted and committed by Robert late Earl of Essex and his Complices," which was published in 1601. In this work Bacon says: "About the Middle of Michaelmas term, Her Majesty had a purpose to dine at my lodge at Twickenham Park, at which time I had—though I profess not to be a poet—prepared a sonnet, directly tending and alluding to draw on Her Majesty's reconcilement to my Lord Essex, which I remember I also showed to a great person."

Here Bacon, writing in 1601, says: "I profess not to be a poet," which seems to fit in exactly with the testimony of Florio.

Bacon in 1603 repeats the same story of his being "a concealed poet" in his letter to John Davis, whom he

asks to use his good offices on his behalf with King James I., for he concludes: "So desiring you to be good to concealed poets."

Similarly in his last prayer Bacon says: "I have though in a despised weed procured the good of all men." Despised weed signifies a mean disguise. What disguise could be meaner than the name of the drunken, illiterate clown of Stratford-upon-Avon?

Again, the "gentleman"—the man of position—"who loved better to be a poet than to be counted so," writes in the "Shakespeare" Sonnet, No. 76:—

> "Why write I still all one ever the same,
> And keepe invention in a noted weed,
> That every word doth almost sel* my name
> Shewing their birth and where they did proceed."

Here we see that the writer of the Shakespeare plays tells us, in the actual words of Bacon in his last prayer, that he keeps his works of invention, that is, his poetical and dramatic works, concealed under a noted weed, a pseudonym, a mean disguise.

In Book VII. of his "De Augmentis," 1623, which was, however, not translated till 1640, Bacon again repeats the same story, for he says: "As for myself (excellent King) to speak the truth of myself, I have often wittingly and willingly neglected the glory of mine own Name, and Learning (if any such thing be), both in the works I now publish, and in those which I contrive for hereafter; whilst I study to promote the good and profit of mankind."

At about this time also Sir Toby Matthew, acknowledging "some great and noble token" which he had received from Bacon, writes: "The most prodigious wit that ever I knew, of my own nation and of this side of the sea, is of your Lordship's name, though he be known by another."

* Sel may mean sell or spell or tell.

Can anyone continue to doubt that Bacon wrote under Masks, Disguises and Pseudonyms?

EDWIN DURNING LAWRENCE.

Jan. 11th, 1913.

SHAKESPEARE IN THE THEATRE.

MR. WILLIAM POEL recently contributed a series of articles to the *Nation* on "Shakespeare in the Theatre." Mr. Poel entitled his second article "Position of Editors," and in it goes out of his way to have a tilt at Baconians in the following paragraph:—

> The arguments brought forward in the Bacon-Shakespeare controversy are a striking illustration of the imperfect knowledge of editors as to the playwright's art. While the Baconians pride themselves on discovering a similarity in the phraseology or philosophical sentiments of the two writers, they forget that Shakespeare was pre-eminent in the writing of drama—an art that is as difficult to master as that of a painter or a musician, and in which the hand of an amateur can be so easily detected; an art for which Bacon had slight opportunities of training and showed no aptitude. A novelist who describes characters vividly was once asked why she seldom made them talk. Her answer was, "I have little talent for writing dialogue; when my characters speak they often cease to be the same people." Undoubtedly, Bacon would have given the same answer to anyone attributing to him the plays of Shakespeare.

Before Mr. Poel again comments on what he terms *the Bacon-Shakespeare controversy*, it would be well that he should obtain some information as to the grounds upon which the Baconian case is founded. The similiarity in the phraseology or philosophical sentiment of the two writers is only one phase of it, and that by no means the most important. The utter mental confusion of Mr. Poel is manifest when he writes:

"They (*i.e.*, the Baconians) forget that Shakespeare was pre-eminent in the writing of drama—an art that is as difficult to master as that of a painter or musician, and in which the hand of an amateur can be as easily detected." Upon what evidence can it be contended that he of Stratford had experience or training in the drama to justify his inclusion in the circle (if it existed) of professional dramatists? There is not a vestige of evidence to point to such a conclusion. Such information as is available as to his life up to the very hour that the early dramas were produced is inconsistent with such a contention. If he did not write the Shakespeare Plays, he was not even an amateur. To anyone who has thoughtfully studied the Shakespeare Plays and recognised their value as drama and as literature, the Stratford authorship is unthinkable. The author *was* "pre-eminent in the writing of drama," but Mr. Poel does not appear to recognise that the point at issue is the personality of that author. But he knows very little of Bacon who can say that the drama was an art which Bacon had slight opportunities of learning, and for which he showed no aptitude. Let it be remembered that there were no dramas in the English language to serve as models for the author of the Shakespeare Plays. He originated a new dramatic style which has never been equalled then or since. This was founded on the Attic and Roman dramas. The articles from the pen of the late Mr. Churton Collins, which appeared in the *Fortnightly Review*, 1903, on this point will at once occur to the reader. That distinguished writer says: "It is, indeed, in the extraordinary analogies — analogies in sources, in particularity of detail and point, and in relative frequency of employment, presented by his metaphors to the metaphors of the Attic tragedians, that we find the most convincing testimony of his familiarity with their writings." Bacon was as familiar with both

the Greek and Roman dramas as he was with his native tongue. He had not only read them, but studied them, and copiously annotated them. The dramas of France and modern Italy were equally at his command. The works published under his name abound in the use of the stage and terms connected with it as similitudes. They show an intimate knowledge of the art of stage craft. Mr. Poel is wrong. In 1588, 1592, 1594 and 1595, Bacon was engaged in stage productions. If a list be made out of the acquirements which the author of the Shakespeare Plays must have been the possessor, it will be found that only one man has ever lived who possessed them all—and that man was Francis Bacon. *Ergo*, he must have been the author of the plays.

NOTES.

IT is amusing to see with what confidence the Shakespearean controversialists assert that the man who wrote the Bacon Essay on Love could not have written *Romeo and Juliet*. The discredit of originating the argument is usually attributed to Lord Tennyson. No one having more than a very superficial acquaintance with the works bearing the name of Shakespeare or Bacon could have originated such a ridiculous contention, or could repeat it. If both sets of works were not the product of one mind, no two writers have shown such a remarkable agreement in their treatment of the subject. Mr. George Stronach, in an excellent letter contributed to the *Academy*, gives the following passages, which justify the assertion that they were in complete agreement:—

"Will you allow me to endeavour to show that on the subject of 'Love' Shakespeare and Bacon were in complete agreement? Here are the relative passages on which I found my statement:—

Shakespeare: Love gives to every power a double power.

Bacon: Love gives the mind power to exceed itself.

Shakespeare: Is not love a Hercules?

Bacon: What fortune can be such a Hercules as love?

Shakespeare: Love is first learned in a woman's eyes.

Bacon: The eye where love beginneth.

Shakespeare: Love . . . with the motion of all elements.

Bacon: Love is the motion that animateth all things.

Shakespeare: But for my love . . . where nothing wants that want itself doth seek.

Bacon: When we want nothing, then is the season and the opportunity and the spring of love.

Shakespeare: By love, the young and tender wit is turn'd to folly.

Bacon: Love is the child of folly.

Shakespeare: Love is merely [wholly] a madness.

Bacon: Transported to the mad degree of love.

Shakespeare: Love will creep in service where it cannot go.

Bacon: Love must creep in service where it cannot go.

Shakespeare: To be wise and love exceeds man's might; that dwells with gods above.

Bacon: It is not granted man to love and be wise.

Shakespeare: We are soldiers, and may that soldier a mere recreant prove, that means not, hath not, or is not in love.

Bacon: I know not how, but martial men are given to love.

Shakespeare: Why to love I can allege no cause.

Bacon: Love has no cause.

Shakespeare: It cannot be that Desdemona should long continue in love to the Moor . . . nor he is to her . . . she must change for youth.

Bacon: Love is nourished on young flesh.

Shakespeare: Lovers cannot see the pretty follies that themselves commit.

Bacon: A lover always commits some folly.

Shakespeare: O, flatter me, for love delights in praises.

Bacon: There is no flatterer like a lover.

Shakespeare: They here stand martyrs, slain in Cupid's wars.

Bacon: Lovers never thought their profession sufficiently graced till they had compared it to a warfare.

Shakespeare: He's mad that trusts in . . . a boy's love.

Bacon: A boy's love does not last.

I can give many more passages to show that Shake-

speare and Bacon were in exact accord in the whole gamut of love—strong characters not being given to love, of love being fatal to worldly success, of love and self-love, of moderation in love, of witchcraft in love, of the language of love being hyperbolical, of unreciprocated love being treated with contempt, of love the first god, of love not being hid, etc., etc., but the passages are too long for quotation. Most of them will be found in Edwin Reed's book, 'The Truth Concerning Stratford-on-Avon and Shakespeare.'"

The columns of the *Academy* and *Pall Mall Gazette* have recently contained considerable correspondence on different phases of the subject. The battle has been very one-sided. No one reading the letters can fail to recognise that the writers who support the Baconian theory have far greater knowledge of the literature of the period than have their opponents.

In compliance with requests from several of the members of the Bacon Society, it has been arranged to renew the reunions of members either weekly or on alternate weeks. Friday evenings have been selected as most likely to suit the convenience of the largest number. The meetings will be held in the library at 11, Hart Street, W.C., and will be of a conversational character. Any members who desire to avail themselves of this opportunity of meeting their fellow-members should send their names to the Secretary, who will give them further information and advise them of the dates as they are arranged.

A largely-attended meeting of the Society was held on the 30th of October, 1912, at Mrs. Bunten's Studio, Hogarth Road, S.W. Addresses were delivered by

Mr. Harold Hardy and Mr. W. T. Smedley, and discussion followed.

Mrs. Bunten has placed her studio at the service of a number of members who are desirous of investigating the biliteral cipher. Mr. Ernest Payne has been making photographs of pages of the "Novum Organum" from the original edition, 1620, and these will be presented as lantern slides considerably enlarged, so that facilities may be afforded for testing the accuracy of the deciphering.

Sir Edwin Durning-Lawrence has given several lectures on the Shakespeare myth, which have been attended by large gatherings. The Chelsea Town Hall on one of these occasions was crowded with an audience which exhibited deep interest in the lecture and warmly applauded it.

"Shakespeare, Bacon, and the Great Unknown," by the late Mr. Andrew Lang, has been widely reviewed. For the most part, the reviewers exhibit a deplorable ignorance of the subject of which that gifted writer treated in his posthumous work. They appear to have little knowledge of Elizabethan literature, or of what is known and what is not known of the life of the Stratford man. A notable exception is the review which appeared in the literary supplement of the *Times*. The historical facts as to the life of Shakspere are stated with a baldness which is quite refreshing.

Johannesburg is becoming interested in the Shakespeare authorship. Under the auspices of the Jewish Guild a large audience gathered to hear a discourse by Mr. J. E. Forrest on the "Vexed Question." It is re-

ported that he spoke for two hours without notes of any description, and weighed the fors and againsts in judicial manner, describing his efforts as those of "the devil's advocate." A discussion followed, and the report states that "the most noticeable speeches were delivered by gentlemen who appeared to have strong Baconian leanings." A full-dress debate is to take place later on.

REVIEW.

The Lost Language of Symbolism. An enquiry into the origin of certain letters, words, names, fairy-tales, folklore and mythologies, by Harold Bayley. Williams and Norgate, London. Two Vols., 800 pp., cloth, 24s. net.

THIS book is an amplification of Mr. Harold Bayley's "A New Light on the Renaissance." In that work he propounded new and interesting theories on the purpose for which symbolical designs were introduced into printing and paper-marks. In the "Lost Language of Symbolism" the author has widened the range of his investigations and brought together such a wealth of information on the subject as never before has been presented to the reading public. He makes no idle boast when he says that he has taken all symbolism to be his province.

The work is embellished with 1,400 facsimile of mediæval emblems.

To give any adequate description of the extent of the array of information given as to the ancient and modern symbolisms of East and West would occupy several numbers of this journal. The author traces from fresh vantage ground the direct continuity between the symbols of pre-Christian art and philosophy and the insignia of Christianity. The chapters on the important influence which symbolism has exercised upon language are of special interest. Mr. Harold Bayley must have covered an enormous range of literature of every description to obtain his facts. He has a remarkable aptitude for recognising similitudes and is aided in the working out of his theories by a fertile imagination, the exercise of which in investigations of such a subject is indispensable. But the volumes must be read to be appreciated. They will probably take rank as one of the standard works on the subject.

CORRESPONDENCE.

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

SIR,—Recurring again to Mr. Hutchinson's "new view" of the Sonnets, I showed in my letter printed in your October number, that there is nothing new in this view. That as far back as 1907-8 I was treating this "view" as a commonplace. This is evident in the opening lines of one of my papers, quoted in my letter, viz :—

> "I suppose there is no person now, no student, at least, who doubts that the Sonnets have reference to the author, and to his genius, his art, and his writings."

If this view of the Sonnets, standing alone, is interesting, it seems to me vastly more so that the same symbology may be traced in a number of plays. In three papers sent you I showed, or endeavoured to show, that at least four of the plays, *The Tempest*, *Winter's Tale*, *Cymbeline*, and *Pericles* carried this symbolism. In the Sonnets it is too obvious to be very interesting, but it is not so easily detected in the plays where story, plot, and a running narrative tend to obscure it. I think those who find interest in the theory as applied to the Sonnets, will find much more in tracing it in the plays. Mr. Hutchinson's paper seems to have had one merit which mine did not. It has aroused interest in the theory. Only two of my papers were published—"A Piece of Tender Air," in October, 1907, and "Summer's Honey Breath," in January, 1908. The third paper, "Leontes' Heir," is probably among your files. My purpose in these papers was to show that the plays mentioned carry the same veiled meaning as the Sonnets, are a part and parcel of them in significance, and that by the expressions "summer's honey breath," "a piece of tender air" and "Leontes' heir," Shakespeare meant exactly the same as he means by "thee," "thou," &c., in the Sonnets.

Very respectfully,

C. G. HORNOR.

Guthrie, Oklahoma, December 20th, 1912.

An Anecdote of "willm Shagfper" in London.

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

SIR,—If the readers of BACONIANA who, like the writer, have owned and read the quarterly from the first issue of the magazine in 1892, could be furnished with more particulars of the true life of the Stratford peasant, "willm Shagfper" (1563—1616), items that have not yet appeared in the columns of BACONIANA, or if printed long ago, will bear repetition, it would be interesting and instructive.

The way to win the anti-Shagfper cause is to state and continue repeating the facts of that peasant's life. In 1900, in his book "Shaksper not Shakespeare," William Henry Edwards, A.M., of Charlestown, West Virginia, U.S.A., and in that 48 page pamphlet by Majoi G. H. P. Burns, printed in 1903 at Leicester, England, the writers have followed this plan. They have recorded facts that cannot be denied or refuted. The extracts from the Stratford records in Major Burns' booklet contain dates that Halliwell-Phillipps and Sidney Lee have suppressed—a conclusive proof that their examination of the Stratford Town records was very superficial. This is not to be wondered at, for the "Shagsper cause" is maintained by garbled statements, falsehoods, fallacies, the suppression of disagreeable facts, &c. Edwin Reed in his books gives many illustrations of their methods.

The writer would call particular attention to the only documentary evidence of what "willm" said and did when living in London. In the 11th edition of Halliwell-Phillipps' "Outlines" (1898), on page 266 of Vol. II., is printed a copy of a letter by Edmund Malone (1741—1812), an accepted "Shaksper" authority. In this letter Mr. Malone states that the name of the father of the Stratford man was never written with the final "e" until 1650, therefore in the following extract from the diary of John Manningham (1602—1603), acting on Malone's authority, the name is spelled without a final "e." In that 1898 edition of "Outlines," on page 82 of Vol. I., is a facsimile of a Feb. 2, 1601-2 item from the diary, but the very important one of March 13, 1601-2, the very one that narrates an anecdote of "willm," was not reproduced in facsimile ; it was suppressed altogether, although it had been printed in the earlier editions of "Outlines." Mr. D. G. Lambert, in his "Shakespeare Documents," also suppressed all mention of this March item. Neither in either of these books is there any mention of that index-page of the Northumberland manuscripts (a manuscript which gave the death-knell to the Shagsper cause) that was brought to light in 1867. A manuscript on which (as so pointedly stated by Dr. Appleton Morgan, President of the N.Y. Shakespeare So.) was written before 1598, on the same page, by the same pen, the names of Francis Bacon and William Shake-speare and the names of two Shake-speare plays. Thus is the life of the "Divine willm" concocted by the Stratfordians.

The two extracts which follow are arranged as to length of lines from that facsimile of John Manningham's manuscript as printed in "Outlines."

IV. An Extract from the Diary of John Manningham, a barrister of the Middle Temple, London, 1601-2 : from the original in the British Museum. MS. Harl. 5353.

Feb., 1601-2.

At our feast wee had a play called twelve night
or what you will . . . much like ye comedy of

errors or Menechmi in Plautus but most like and neere to that in Italian called Ingann i a good practise in it to make ye steward beleeve his lady widdowe was in love with him, by counterfayting a letter as from his lady in generall termes, telling him what shee liked best in him, and prescribing his gesture in smiling, his apparaile, &c., and then when he came to practise making him belieue they took him to be mad, &c.

March 18, 1601-2.

Upon a tyme Burbidge played Rich. 3, there was a citizen gaen so farr in liking with him, that before shee went from the play shee appointed him to come that night unto her by the name of Rich. the 3. Shaksper overhearing their conclusion went before, was entertained and at his game ere Burbidge came. Then Message being brought that Rich. the 3 was at dore, Shaksper caused return to be made that William the Conquerour was before Rich. the 3. Shaksper's name William.

While this anecdote of the "Divine willm" has been printed in one or more "Anti-Shagsper" books written by American authors, English writers of similar books seem to have refrained from giving to the public this the only record of what "willm" said and did while in London. This March item confirms very conclusively the statement found by Hon. Ignatius Donnelly in the mathematical cipher in the 1623 Folio, viz., that "willm Shagsper" was only a gate-keeper at a theatre, in which theatre (it is stated in another cipher) Anthony Bacon (1558—1601) is said to have had an extensive financial interest. Being a gate-keeper only, and not an actor, "willm" was able to get away soon after the performance commenced, after the audience had entered the theatre; while Burbidge, being an actor, was compelled to stay until the play was over. Thus "William the Conquerour," as can readily be seen, was able to arrive at the appointed place before the actor Burbidge.

AN AMERICAN SUBSCRIBER AND READER.

"Not without Mustard."

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

SIR,—In BACONIANA for October, 1912, Sir E. Durning Lawrence makes great play with the scene in *Every Man out of his Humour* between Sogliardo, Sir Puntarvolo, and Carlo Buffone, where Sogliardo boasts of his coat of arms, obtained after

much toiling "among the harrots" (his crest being a "boar without a head, rampant"), and where Puntarvolo suggests that his motto should be "not without mustard." Sir Edwin had already given prominence to this scene in his "Bacon Is Shakespeare" book (1910), and he seems to direct our attention to the comparison between Puntarvolo's suggested motto and Shakespeare's "*Non Sans Droiet*" as though it were some new discovery.* May I point out that in my "Shakespeare Problem Restated," published in June, 1908, I went fully into all this and set forth the scene from *Every Man out of his Humour* at length? (see page 461 *et seq.*). As I believe Sir Edwin did me the honour to read my book I think there must be some "unconscious cerebration" at work here!

Sir Edwin says he transcribes the extract given by him "from an extremely rare early quarto" which is in his library, and that it is from Act III., scene i., of the play, but that "modern editions" give it as Act III., scene iv. But Nicholson and Herford's edition of Ben Jonson, from which I took the long extract which I published, gives the scene word for word as quoted by Sir Edwin and gives it also as Act III., scene i.

I should not be at all surprised to learn that others before me had suspected a reference to Shakespeare (or Shakspere) in this passage of Ben Jonson's play—indeed, it would be surprising if they have not done so—but if such is the case I have no knowledge of it and should be glad to be enlightened as to the fact.

Yours faithfully, G. G. GREENWOOD.

House of Commons, Nov. 18, 1912.

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

SIR,—in the last number of BACONIANA Sir Edwin Durning-Lawrence, not for the first time, points out the significance of the coat-of-arms scene in *Every Man out of his Humour*, produced for the first time in 1599. To our readers it may seem as if "thrice he slew the slain," and that the reference by Ben Jonson to the alleged grant of arms by the Heralds' College the very year before to John Shakespere had been fully demonstrated. But Sir Edwin knows well that such facts must be driven into the unwilling minds of the public by much hammering, and can scarcely be too often repeated. Let me add to them perhaps the smallest point that has ever been made on the subject—viz., a comma. Except in dimensions it is by no means insignificant. On the 30th March, 1908, I examined at the Heralds' College the entries relating to the grant. There are two rough drafts much altered. At the head of the page on which they appear is written "Shakespere, 1598" (in the body of the proposed grant the name is "Shakespeare"), and on the left top margin is tucked the coat-of-arms—gold, on a bend sable a spear of the first, steeled, argent,

* As such he has again brought it forward in *Notes and Queries*.

and, for cognisance, a falcon, his wings displayed, &c. Above the arms is the motto. Herein is the point—for in the first draft the motto is written "*Non, Sans Droit*"="No, without right," although in the second it is written "*Non sans droit*"="Not without right." The secret history of the insertion of that comma in the first place and its omission in the second would be enlightening.—Yours faithfully, J. R., of Gray's Inn.

18th November, 1912.

The "Shakespeare" Sonnets.

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

SIR, In reference to my articles on the "Shakespeare" Sonnets which have recently appeared in your pages, may I ask you to do me the favour of giving publicity to the following "Note," which I have thought necessary to append to the reprint of my last article in pamphlet form, and which will, I hope, render unnecessary any special reply from me to Mr. C. G. Hornor, as to his remark respecting the "newness" of my "views." Thanking you in advance for this, I am, yours very truly,

JOHN HUTCHINSON.

NOTE.

Some of my correspondents demur, however, to my description of my "view" as "new," saying they think they have seen it mooted "elsewhere," and have, moreover, "anticipated" it in their own thoughts. In this, indeed, I cannot but rejoice, as evidence that I do not stand alone in my opinions, but I must add that, until I ventured to ventilate my "new view" in BACONIANA (after, I may say, a hesitation of some half century) I never saw any anticipation of it in print, and, right or wrong, believed it to be "certainly original," as the *Athenæum*, indeed, has pronounced it.—J. H.

"The Love Test."

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

SIR,—The materialistic interpretation put upon the Shake-Spearean Sonnets by Mr. Parker Woodward in his article on "The Love Test" is not borne out by the lesson of the Dedication to the Sonnets which, as I have elsewhere scientifically demonstrated, deals with the Religio Fons.

Francis Bacon was the English Rosicrucian Rex. This fact was made known by him in various ways in his writings with surpassing finesse.

The Sonnets themselves may most certainly be said to form a Hymn of Glory and Praise to the Religio Fons with its Analogue in all mankind.

By the way, Mr. John Hutchinson's spiritual treatment of the Shake-Spearean Sonnets is most admirable, and certain phrases of Mr. H. J. Hadrill's in respect to them are also charmingly appreciative. He well speaks of the author's "consciousness of a higher life and mystical relations with a beyond."

As to Mr. Parker Woodward's assumption that Francis Bacon was the son of a certain Royal Personage I think the theory is quite negatived by Francis Bacon's wonderful autobiographic Play—"Tempes T"; for a careful analysis of it reveals for one thing the almost positive intention of the author to make the sinister witch, "Sycorax," represent Queen Elizabeth.

Yours faithfully,

HENRY WOOLLEN.

112, Caldershaw Road, West Ealing, W., Dec. 3rd, 1912.

Queen Elizabeth's Son.

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

DEAR SIR,—In that extraordinary "Fable like a Historie," "The Argenis," written by John Barclay,* there are many important historical personages set forth under feigned names—personages of the Elizabethan age with whom we are very familiar—who do many things that are unknown to history, and appear in strange and startling surroundings. I have dealt with this in the little book that I published in 1911, "Bacon's Secret Disclosed,"† in the chapter entitled "John Barclay's 'Argenis.'" Here it is shewn that among the other characters introduced is the Queen Hyanisbe, and by the key added to the book in the 1629 edition it is explained that Queen Hyanisbe is Queen Elizabeth. Now in the tale—the Fable like a History—it is shown that Hyanisbe is married to one Siphax, who is described as being "a man of the most eminent qualitie, next the Kings," and of this union there is born a son, who is named Hiempsall; though when he travels abroad, with the permission and knowledge of his mother the Queen, he assumes the name Archombrotus, and under that is known outside his own country. It was very evident to me when writing about this that the name Hiempsall was a concocted or made-up name, and I asked in my book (p. 145): "Can anyone suggest the derivation of this name, or any hint wrapped up in its numerical value?" The mere look of the name suggested to my mind that it had been formed for the purpose of hiding something, especially when this curious name was put

* Joannis Barclaii, "Argenis," Paris, 1621: (First edition). London, 1625: (First English edition). London, 1629: (First edition with key to characters).

† "Bacon's Secret Disclosed in Contemporary Books." London: Gay & Hancock, Ltd., Henrietta Street, Covent Garden. 1911.

forward as that of the son of Hyanisbe, the feigned name for Queen Elizabeth. It was only a few weeks ago that I received a note from Mr. Ben Haworth Booth, of Rolston Hall, Hornsea, Hull—a gentleman who had been interested in my book—pointing out that the name Hiempsall contained the anagram, "I spell Ham." Every letter is complete. To the ordinary reader of "The Argenis" the discovery of such an anagram as this in the name of Queen Hyanisbe's son would convey little or nothing, and it would be of no more importance to spell "Ham" than to spell "Beer." But to one having the key to the names in "The Argenis," and knowing that Hyanisbe meant Queen Elizabeth, the fact is somewhat startling, and somewhat significant, that her son's name spells "Ham," when the secret story tells us that his name was "Bacon." Of course I easily hear the would-be wise and keen-witted gentry exclaim, "Oh! a mere co-incidence." It is so easy to evoke the all-powerful "coincidence" to explain any difficult or troublesome passage. But I think to any unbiassed mind the explanation is much more reasonable that John Barclay saw more than meets the eye when he concocted the name Hiempsall for Queen Elizabeth's son in his "Fable like a History."

It is, I think, important to point out as having some bearing on this, that the edition in which the key to "The Argenis" was first printed, was not published till 1629—three years after Bacon had retired from the world's stage. Thus, up to that year no one knew who was meant by Hyanisbe, and therefore still less who might be pointed at under the name Hiempsall, even had the anagram been then evolved. The key to the book gave the key to much else besides, if only people knew how to use it. And I am again reminded of the very peculiar fact, as pointed out in my book before alluded to (p. 137), that Charles I. hastened and hurried on the publication of this 1629 edition of "The Argenis," with the key for the first time given to the world. I confess I have been quite unable to imagine any reason for Charles' wish for the publication of this book, with the key; especially when there had already been published in London the 1625 edition with the whole story in English.

I would further note that, I think, it is in the 1629 edition, when the key appears, that the name is first spelt "Hiempsall"; in previous editions it is given as "Hyempsal" and "Hyempsall." Of course for the anagram the spelling I have first given is required. In the 1629 edition the name is spelt with a "y" on two or three occasions, but most frequently with an "i," and it is so spelt on the first occasion that it is introduced as the name of the Queen's son.

GRANVILLE C. CUNINGHAM.

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

DEAR SIR,—That Bacon paid several visits to France is history. Was the death of Francis Duke of Anjou one of the occasions of his crossing the Channel? Is he the mysterious B. alluded to in the following paragraph? That Francis Bacon was intimate with the Duke and how greatly he admired and respected him can be seen in the long paragraph about him in Francis' "State of Christendom."

"In France died Francis Duke of Anjou of sickness which he contracted through grief and trouble of mind. For the sad loss of these two (William of Orange and Duke of Anjou) Queen Elizabeth was very much troubled and sent B. into France (1584) to let the King understand how heavily she took the Duke of Anjou's death, whom she had always found to be a most faithful and dear friend to her" (p. 304, Camden's "Eliz.").

"Francis Duke of Anjou and Brabant, great praise for his calling and quality greatly to be considered as any Prince this day living. . . . There is noted in the disposition of this Prince great mildness, giving satisfaction to all men, facility of address and natural courtesy, understanding and speech great and eloquent, secresy more than is common in the French," &c., &c. (Francis Bacon's "State of Europe").

I am glad of this opportunity to draw attention to the remarkable expression Bacon uses with regard to this Prince and the "diseased state of the world" at the time.

"We do plainly see in the most countries of Christendom so unsound and shaken an estate, as desireth *the help of some great person to set together and join again the pieces asunder and out of joint.*" The italics are my own. Turn to *Hamlet:*

Act I., scene v.

"Still your fingers on your lips I pray.
The time *is out of joint*,—O cursed spite!
That ever I was born to *set it right.*"

And again, Act II., scene ii.

"Thinking our State to be disjoint and out of Frame."

The same idea and term "out of joint" occurs in John Donne's Poems.

"As Mankind so is the world's whole frame
Quite out of joint, almost created lame.
. . . . . .
The world did in her cradle take a fall
And turned her brains, and took a general maim;
Wronging each joint of the universal Frame,
The noblest part Man felt it first, and then
Both beasts and plants, curst in the curse of Man."

Mysterious John Donne! whom I think Gosse accuses of

brushing against Shakespeare in daily life and never mentioning him!

"Still, your fingers on your lips, I pray," essentially Bacon's motto!

May I draw the attention of your readers to another matter? This poem,

DE MORTE,

"Man's Life's a Tragedy. His Mother's womb
(From which he enters) is the Tyring room.
The spacious earth the Theatre. And the Stage
That country which he lives in: Passions, Rage,
Folly, and Vice are actors. The first cry
The Prologue to th'ensuing Tragedy.
The former Act consisteth of Dumb Shows.
The Second, he to more perfection grows!
In the Third he is a man, and doth begin
To nurture Vice, and act the deeds of sin.
In the Fourth declines. In the Fifth diseases clog
And trouble him, then Death's his Epilogue."—IGNOTO

is from "*Reliquiæ Wottonianæ*" in the section "Found among the Papers of Sir Henry Wotton." It appears directly after the poem beginning "This world's a Bubble," attributed to Sir Francis Bacon in Palgrave's "Golden Treasury." It is significant that Francis Bacon wrote thus "On Death" in his prose works:—"Life . . . sends men headlong into this wretched Theatre, when being arrived their first language is that of mourning."

My attention has been drawn to this poem by Mr. Sellars, our ardent Baconian in New South Wales.

Yours sincerely, ALICIA AMY LEITH.

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

SIR,—Will you allow me to draw attention to a few interesting points.

Bacon hid his secrets in order that, like the play of innocent children, they should be found out. It is delightful how we find these secrets wherever we look in the books he claims as his, and how one finds one thing and another finds out the rest and it fits together; we are all trying to solve the great puzzle, and we *never* find anything that does not fit in.

If you will permit me the space I should like to mention two instances of this kind.

Last winter Mr. Basil Brown, of New York, kindly sent me his very interesting pamphlet, "Supposed Caricature of the Droeshout Portrait of Shakespeare," printed privately 1911, and told me besides of his having discovered that the name Droeshout is an anagram of *outherods* (*cp. Hamlet*).

Now, when I came to look at my facsimile copy of the 1623 Folio, I saw that the whole signature is *Martin Droeshout*, the

anagram of which is: *outherods min' art*, meaning, this portrait outdoes anything I have ever drawn.

Dr. Orville W. Owen told me that in all the original copies he had had a chance to examine, this portrait, which, as we all know, is nothing but a mask, is set in; I believe, when the manuscripts are brought to light, and I am convinced that they are all kept and carefully guarded, there will come forth at least one, possibly several copies of the 1623 Folio with Bacon's portrait on the title-page in place of the other.

Mr. Charles P. Bowditch, in his wonderfully interesting book, "The Connection of Francis Bacon with the First Folio of Shakespeare's Plays and with the Books of Cipher of his time" (Cambridge University Press, 1910), explains the joke contained in the address "To the Great Variety of Readers" on page A3, signed "John Heminge" and "Henrie Condell," showing that the *sixpen'orth*, the *shillings worth* and the *fiue shillings worth* are the keys for finding Bacon's name and a longer message hidden in this page. Counting from the end of the sentence which contains these keys and ends with the word *welcome*, the sixth word *Buy* begins with a capital B, the twelfth word *And* after that 1sh=12 pence), with a capital A, and the sixtieth word from there on 5sh=60 pence), counting *Cock-pit* as one word, with the prefix *con*, it is the significant word *confesse*.

When I tested this discovery I noticed the large ornamental F at the top of the page and the capital R directly beside it, very much as on the first page of *The Rape of Lucrece*, where it is printed like this:

When you turn that page A3 of the Folio upside down, you will easily detect a capital R, fitting directly into the space between the F, and forming part of the scrollwork. Whether Mr. Bowditch and the late Mr. Samuel Cabot, who found the hidden message, never noticed this *F R* I do not know; it is not mentioned in the book, but it seems to me to complete their solution. By the way, Mr. Bowditch's comment on the word *honorificabilitudini* is, to me, by far the most interesting and convincing I have ever seen.

In connection with the fact that the letters *Sh* in the fifteenth stanza of *The Rape of Lucrece*, mentioned on page 183 of your October issue of BACONIANA, stands on line 103, I should like to draw attention to the very curious page 103 in an emblem-book by Geffrey Whitney, 1586. It has on it a picture of the Goddess Minerva with the spear, in two different attitudes. On the right she stands erect, before a tree, laden with fruit and leaves, her face turned towards what I take for cornfields, suggesting a harvest; she holds the spear straight and firm with her right hand raised, the large shield covering her left arm, way up to her shoulder. On the left she is sitting down, leaning against a bare tree, and holds her spear slanting, with her right arm hanging

down in an attitude of weariness, her left hand resting the shield on her left knee ; the landscape behind her is barren.

Below the picture stands the following verse :—

"CONTINVAL toile, and labour, is not beste :
But sometimes cease, and rest thy wearie bones,
The daie to worke, the nighte was made to reste,
And studentes must haue pastimes for the nones :
Sometime the Lute, the Chesse, or Bowe by fittes,
For ouermuch, dothe dull the finest wittes.

For lack of reste, the feilde dothe barren growe,
The winter coulde, not all the years doth raigne :
And dailie bente, doth weake the strongest bowe ;
Yea our delightes still vs'd, we doe disdaine.
Then rest by fittes, amongste your great affaires,
But not too muche, leste sloathe dothe set her snares."

The first word, made up entirely of capitals, contains Bacon's whole name, except the B, and that stands directly under the O, beside the capital C. In the first verse note the F-r on the last line and the capital B on the second, and in the second verse the F-r on the first line and the B on the last. The remaining initials of the first verse, S, T, A, I take to stand for St. Albans.

In the small volume of Bacon's "History of Life and Death," published in Dillingen on the Danube, near Augsburg, in 1645, there is a beautiful frontispiece drawn by the same Wolfgang Kilian, who did that most wonderful title-page of the "CRYPTOMENYTICES," by Gustavus Selenus, of 1624. On the former frontispiece the title is given : "Francisci Baronis de Vervlamio, Vicecomitis S. Albani, Historia Vitæ et Mortis," omitting the name Bacon. In the middle at the top there is a very sweet portrait of him at about the age of twelve ; in the four corners are tiny pictures referring to his life, on the second one of which a lute is lying at his feet (*cp.* with the lute mentioned in the above poem) ; on either side are the two Masonic pillars entwined with laurel, which we attribute only to poets.

In the second verse it says in the fifth line : "Then rest by fittes, amongste your great affaires." Mr. William Stone Booth, in his second book, "The Hidden Signatures of Francesco Colonna and Francis Bacon" (W. A. Butterfield, 59, Bromfield Street, Boston, Mass.), page 44, quotes a poem, dedicated by John Davies "To the royall, ingenious, and all-learned knight, Sir Francis Bacon," in which he says that he "embosomed his Muse for sport twixt grave affaires."

Bacon, in his poem, uses the word "pastimes" in the fourth line, and in the last but one, "amongste your great affaires," precisely the same idea, expressed in almost the same words. Most likely John Davies knew this wise little poem of Bacon's, and quoted from memory.

Now others, who may never have seen this picture in Geffrey

Whitney's book, nor ever have read John Davies' verses, have proved that in the periods when Bacon was not in office one Shakespeare play after another came out; whilst, on the other hand, in the years when he was in office, and busy with his "great affaires," he had to let his Shakespeare-Muse, Pallas Athæna, with her spear, sit down and rest, and then the tree was bare and bore no fruit, and not a single play was published.

There will be a great deal of all this sort of evidence in my book, "Bacon-Shakespeare? Der Wahrheit die Ehre!" which is being printed by Friedrich Gustch in Karlsruhe now, with over forty illustrations. May it help towards making my dear countrymen and women open their eyes to the truth!

Yours faithfully, A. M. VON BLOMBERG.

116, Charles Street, Boston, Mass., U.S.A., Sept., 1912.